

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 3 and 7 are amended. Claim 6 is canceled. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Support for the amendments to claim 3 can be found in the specification as originally filed, for example in FIGS. 1-3. No new matter is added by these amendments.

**I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 3-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,548,350 to Yamada et al. Applicants disagree.

The Patent Office alleges that Yamada et al. discloses all limitations recited in claims 3-7.

**A. Claims 3-5 and 7**

Applicants submit that Yamada et al. fails to disclose a rear projector having a housing that has a front side thereof formed with an opening defined by an opening edge portion of the housing wherein the housing is one piece as recited in amended claim 3.

On the contrary, Yamada et al. discloses a framework 2 that supports a screen 1 and inserts into a cabinet 3 (see Abstract). Specifically, an edge of the framework 2 in Yamada et al. inserts into slot 3b in the cabinet 3 to attach the framework 2 and the cabinet 3 (see col. 5 lines 10-12). Further, a peripheral end part of the screen 1 is inserted into and coupled with slot 2e in the framework 2 through elastic member 5 to connect the screen 1 to the framework 2 and the cabinet 3 (see col. 5, lines 56-58). Therefore, the framework 2 and the cabinet 3 of Yamada et al. are each a separate piece which must be connected to support the screen 1 coupled to the slot 2e of the framework. Yamada et al. thus describes a two piece design.

To the contrary, the housing in claim 3 in the present application is one piece having an opening edge portion for receiving a screen panel. As detailed in the Preliminary

Amendment filed on September 13, 2005, the differences between these designs is quite substantial.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Yamada et al. fails to disclose a rear projector having a housing that has a front side thereof formed with an opening defined by an opening edge portion of the housing, wherein the housing is one piece as required in claim 3 and 5-7.

**B. Claim 5**

With respect to claim 5, Applicants submit that Yamada et al. also fails to disclose a rear projector having the novel structural elements as specifically defined in dependent claim 5. Specifically, Applicants submit that Yamada et al. fails to disclose a holder that holds the screen panel from the rear side of the screen panel, wherein the opening edge portion has a first portion opposed to the screen panel, and has a second portion projected from the first portion to the rear side of the screen panel at the outer side of the periphery of the screen panel, and the holder is secured to the second portion so that the elastic member and the screen panel are clamped between the holder and the first portion as recited in claim 5.

Instead, Yamada et al. discloses an elastic member 5 having a first surface fixed to the screen 1 and a second surface fixed to the framework 2 by a sticking means, a cementing means or the elastic member 5 is a double sided adhesive surface tape (see col. 5, lines 59-65). Further, Yamada et al. discloses that adhesive forces from the elastic member 5 secures the screen 1 to the framework 2. Nowhere does Yamada et al. disclose a holder that holds the screen panel from the rear side of the screen panel as required in claim 5.

Additionally, Yamada et al. discloses that the elastic member 5 is a screen securing means which may inhibit separation of the screen 1 from the framework 2 when replacing or repairing the screen 1. As a result, the screen 1 and the framework 2 of Yamada et al. may have to be replaced together. On the contrary, the claimed holder recited in claim 5 secures

the screen with a non-adhesive elastic member which only fills a gap between the opening edge portion of the housing and the screen panel, and thus the screen can be easily replaced.

Therefore, Yamada et al. also fails to disclose the claimed features as specifically defined in claim 5.

**C. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Yamada et al. fails to disclose each and every limitation of independent claim 3 and thus cannot anticipate claim 3, or any of the additional features recited in the dependent claims thereof. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

**II. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3-5 and 7 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Brian C. Anscomb  
Registration No. 48,641

JAO:BCA/hs

Date: January 9, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--